

## Remarks

### 1. Drawings

The drawings were objected to for failing to include the "rectangular cleaning attachment" recited in claim 49. This claim is hereby canceled such that no change to the drawings is believed necessary.

### 2. § 112

The antecedent basis issue regarding the "drive shaft" recited in claim 30 has been addressed by the above amendment. Thus, the indefiniteness rejection to claims 30-32 is believed to be overcome.

### 3. §§ 102

#### a. Anticipation of claims 1, 5-7, 10-13, 20, 30-32 by Baker

Amended claim 1 (and thus claims 5-7, 10-13 and 20) now recite that the packet is a separate item that is disposed between the cleaning attachment and the carrier to control the release of the surface treatment composition through the cleaning attachment packet of surface treatment composition. Baker does not disclose the use of a separate packet of composition, and thus does not anticipate these claims. Baker merely discloses a fluid reservoir 162, which does not provide the convenience of the packet delivery disclosed by the Applicants.

Amended claim 30 (and thus claims 31 & 32) recite a reciprocating brush, which is not anticipated by Baker's rotating brush.

#### b. Anticipation of claims 1 and 10-13 by Adams

As mentioned above, amended claim 1 (and thus claims 10-13) recite a packet of surface treatment composition. As with Baker, this is not disclosed by Adams.

#### c. Anticipation of claims 21 and 29 by Stout

Amended claim 21 (and thus claim 29) now recite that the flexible mount has a plurality of flexible elongated pillars, which is not anticipated by the springs in the Stout reference.

d. Anticipation of claims 30-32 by Hoffman

Amended claim 30 (and thus claim 31) now recite the subject matter of canceled claim 32 in that the scrub brush includes an elongated body disposed between the carrier and the cleaning attachment. This is not disclosed by Hoffman since the bristled cleaning surface 24 does not have an elongated body and it is not disposed between the cleaning head 20 and cleaning surface 26.

e. Anticipation of claims 33-37, 47 and 49-51 by Blaustein

Claims 33-59 are hereby canceled.

4. § 103

a. Obviousness of claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-18 and 20 by Siman and Dickler

As mentioned above, claim 1 (and thus claims 2-20) are hereby amended to require a separate packet of surface treatment composition be included in the cleaning device between the carrier and the cleaning attachment for controlled release of the composition during use.

Neither Siman nor Dickler, nor any of the other numerous references cited by the Office and of record in the application, discloses or suggests a powered cleaner in which the cleaning composition is self-contained in packet form. The benefits of packet delivery of the cleaner are numerous, however, primarily it provides a convenient, no-mess way for the consumer to add a cleaner to the device. Filling reservoirs (such as in Baker) and the like can be avoided entirely. The packet delivery technique also provides for controlled release of the composition, which can be accomplished by using a dissolvable casing or perforations. If the packets are dissolvable, there is even less work for the consumer since the expended packets need not be discarded after use.

The convenience of detergent packets was acknowledged in the Dickler reference. There, however, the packets were to be deposited in a volume of water where the packet would dissolve and allow the cleaner to be dispersed into the water. Depending on the composition of the cleaner inside the packet, the aqueous cleaner solution could then be used to clean various items, as any other detergent and water solution in which the cleaner was not delivered in packet form.

Although Dickler teaches the idea of packeted cleaning composition, it does not provide sufficient motivation to combine Dickler with the Siman reference as asserted by the Office. Powered cleaning devices with cleaning pads have been in existence for many years, as evidenced by the Young reference, which issued in 1972. It is telling that, despite the numerous references of record in this case, none of the prior art discloses a cleaning device with packet delivery of the composition, despite its convenience. Therefore, the combination is not obvious.

Several matters would have had to be overcome for such a combination to be thought possible, and thus apparent to one of skill in the art. Such issues include how and where the packet would be mounted, whether an activating agent (such as water) would be able to reach the packet sufficiently to deliver sufficient composition, how to deposit the composition onto the cleaning head, whether it would interfere with the mounting of the cleaning head or disrupt the reciprocal motion of the device, how to make the packet accessible for the user, etc.

Using hindsight these issues may appear to be routine matters of design, however, that would only be the case once the connection was made to use packet delivery in a powered cleaner. But, convention, as in the Baker and Siman references and others, suggested using liquid reservoirs or supply hoses at or leading to the inside the housing to carry the composition in mixed or pre-mixed form, or even perhaps using pre-impregnated cleaning heads. The art does not teach or suggest placing a self-contained packet of composition between the cleaning head and the reciprocating part of the cleaner. Moreover, there is no motivation in the art to combine the Siman and Dickler references.

Thus, Applicants respectfully ask that the patentability of these claims be reconsidered in light of the foregoing remarks.

b. Other obviousness rejections

The various obviousness rejections on pages 6-10 to the dependent claims of independent claim 1 are believed to be overcome in light of the remarks stated in part 4a above.

The obviousness rejections to the dependent claims of amended independent claim 21 on pages 10 and 11 are believed to be overcome by the above amendment to claim 21.

No obviousness rejections were made against claims 30 and 31.

The obviousness rejections to the dependent claims of independent claim 33 and its dependent claims are now moot in light of the cancellation of claims 33-59.

5. Conclusion

Accordingly, claims 1-31 as amended are believed to now be in allowable form. Reconsideration and allowance of these claims is thus respectfully requested.

The above amendments have not increased the total claim count or the number of independent claims. Thus, no fees are believed necessary for consideration of this response. Nevertheless, should any additional fees be needed for full consideration of this amendment, please charge any fees believed necessary in connection with this response to Deposit Account No. 10-0849 .

Respectfully submitted,

David C. Long, et al.

By:   
Linda Blair Meier  
Reg. No.: 39,769  
Attorney For Applicant  
S.C. Johnson & Son, Inc.  
1525 Howe Street  
Racine, Wisconsin 53403  
(262) 260-2474